

Offeror's Question	RFP paragraph and page reference	Government response
1. The offeror interprets the amendment to mean the Sample Work Order is 21 days in length, 12 hours per day, 7 days per week and should be costed according to a full 21 working days of 12 hours each in length. No time off for holidays or weekends should be proposed during the 21 days. Is this correct? If not, please clarify.	Amendment 2, page 14, Section a.(1) 1 st sentence starting "Offeror should propose site..."	Yes, you are correct. No time off for holidays or weekends should be proposed..
2. Does the Medical Examination Results type of report need to be removed from the table?	Amendment 2, page 19, Section 8.0, Reporting (d) list of deliverables	Yes. Remove the Medical Examination requirement from the table. It is no longer required due to the deletion of the Medical Review requirement in Amendment 02.
3. The sentence says the offeror should include a schedule showing all proposed unburdened labor category rates for ALL years involved. Should this line be removed?	Amendment 2, page 15, part (2), Direct Labor Rates, 2 nd sentence starting "The Offeror should..."	Yes. Remove the reference to "all years". For purposes of evaluation only the Sample Task Order is being evaluated and there is no yearly requirement
Could the government please provide its rationale for including paragraph H.2., Organizational Conflict of Interest clause, page 6 Amendment II to Solicitation W911W4-06-R-0013 clause.		The clause is incorporated to preclude privileged information from being utilized as an advantage. Information concerning deployments, troop needs, etc could appear to give the contractor an unfair competitive edge.
Amendment 01 stated that there would be additional questions answered in conjunction with		One set of the duplicate questions have been deleted from the website.

Amendment 02. The website reflects two sets of questions answered: 14 September and 15 September. However, both sets of questions and answers are identical. Are there additional questions and answers besides those shown on the website?		The answers provided herein will be the last questions. addressed.
The revision to Paragraph 2.1.1 states, "The costs associated with any personnel provided to participate in exercises who are not qualified linguists (CAT I, CAT II, or CAT III) shall not be considered as allowable, allocable costs under any order issued under this IDIQ contract." Is it the Government's intention that all management and support labor (i.e. Program Manager, Field Site Managers, etc.) are not direct charge to the Program?	Amendment 02, Page 4 – Paragraph 2.1.1	It is the Government's intention, with this paragraph, to assure that personnel provided to participate for exercises are linguists with the required language skills and not role players who may not have the requisite language skills required to perform the services. Offerors proposed approach for managers, support labor, etc should be IAW the company's standard accounting practices.